



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CW

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/855,989	05/15/2001	Edward D. Brill	2206.64630	9366

24978 7590 11/21/2003

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN
300 S WACKER DR
25TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

PRONE, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/855,989

Applicant(s)

BRILL ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Prone

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15, 16 and 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 14.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 7, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Soultanian (6,163,092).

'092 discloses the invention including a stationary piece (10) having a plurality of laminations (38), a moving piece (12) having a plurality of laminations (40), that the moving piece is hingedly secured (48) to the stationary piece by interlocking the moving piece laminations with the stationary piece laminations (Figs. 2 and 4), an electric coil (14), a movement control system connected to the stationary piece and the moving piece (32) having at least one spring (22) and at least one device for adjusting the tension (34), that the coil is on the stationary piece (Fig. 2), a driver (24) crimped to the moving piece (18) for connection to a motor load (26), a hinge holder having a first surface that retains the moving piece axially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate (Fig. 2), a coil bobbin (16) on the stationary piece around which the coil is wound (Fig. 1), that the coil bobbin also has an extension to which the movement control system is connected to (30), that the movement control system is connected to the

Art Unit: 3724

driver (Fig. 1), and a low friction insert between the stationary and moving pieces where they are hinged (20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of WO 00/27599. '092 discloses the invention but fails to disclose a hinge holder having a second surface that biases the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate. WO 00/27599 teaches of a hinge holder having a second surface that biases the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate (22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 with a hinge holder having a second surface, as taught by WO 00/27599, to bias the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate.

5. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092. '092 discloses the invention including that the circular shaped end fits inside the circular shaped opening (Fig. 6) and that the movement control system is located at a second end of the moving piece (Fig. 12) but fails to disclose that the stationary piece has the circular shape at a first end and the moving piece forms the circular shaped opening at a first end. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 3724

at the time the invention was made to switch the circular shaped end and the circular shaped opening, since it has been held that a mere reversal of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Einstein*, 8 USPQ 167.

6. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of Davis. '092 discloses the invention including that the movement control system includes a screw (34) having threads and a head (Fig. 1) but fails to disclose that the screw being adjustably threaded in an opening in the stationary piece, that the screw passes freely through an opening in the moving piece, that the stationary piece opening is located on one side of the moving piece opening and the screw head is located on the other side of the moving piece opening, a first spring between the stationary and moving pieces, and a second spring between the moving piece and the screw head. Davis teaches a screw (46) being adjustably threaded in an opening in the stationary piece (40), that the screw passes freely through an opening in the moving piece (41), that the stationary piece opening is located on one side of the moving piece opening and the screw head is located on the other side of the moving piece opening (Fig. 2), a first spring between the stationary and moving pieces (50), and a second spring between the moving piece and the screw head (Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 with the movement control system characteristics, as taught by Davis, to allow for a more precise adjustment.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of Huppert, Sr. '092 discloses the invention but fails to disclose at least one

Art Unit: 3724

grease channel in the hinge. Huppert, Sr. teaches a grease channel (8) in a hinged structure (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 with a grease channel, as taught by Huppert, Sr., to allow for a smoother hinged surface.

8. Claims 17, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of Wahl et al. (5,787,587). '092 discloses the invention including a stationary piece (10) having a plurality of laminations (38) and a coil (14), a moving piece (12) having a plurality of laminations (40), that the moving piece is hinged (48) to the stationary piece at one end by interlocking the moving piece laminations with the stationary piece laminations (Figs. 2 and 4), a driver (24) at another end of the moving piece (Fig. 2), a movement control system connected to the stationary piece and the moving piece (32) having at least one spring (22) and at least one device for adjusting the tension (34), a hinge holder having a first surface that retains the moving piece axially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate (Fig. 2), a coil bobbin (16) on the stationary piece around which the coil is wound (Fig. 1), and that the coil bobbin also has an extension to which the movement control system is connected to (30) but fails to disclose a case having at least one attachment point for securing the motor, a stationary blade, a moving blade adapted for reciprocation across the moving blade, a motor secured to the case at the attachment point, that the driver and the moving blade are coupled for movement of the moving blade, that the stationary piece and the moving piece have a plurality of laminations and a hinge made of interlocking laminations of the stationary and moving pieces. '587 teaches a case having at least one attachment

Art Unit: 3724

point for securing the motor (Fig. 1), a stationary blade (104), a moving blade (122) adapted for reciprocation across the moving blade (A), a motor secured to the case at the attachment point (Fig. 1), and that the driver and the moving blade are coupled for movement of the moving blade (120). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 with hair clipper components, as taught by '587, to allow for use as a hair clipper.

9. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '092 in view of '587 as applied to claims 17 and 18 above, and further in view of WO 00/27599. '092 and '587 disclose the invention but fail to disclose a hinge holder having a second surface that biases the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate. WO 00/27599 teaches a hinge holder having a second surface that biases the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate (22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided '092 in view of '587 with a hinge holder having a second surface, as taught by WO 00/27599, to bias the moving piece radially while still allowing the moving piece to rotate.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 and 17-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The use of the Pfenning has been withdrawn due to the fact that is not analogous art. However under further review the Soultanian (6,163,092) patent does disclose a moving piece that is

Art Unit: 3724

hingedly secured (48) to the stationary piece by interlocking the moving piece laminations with the stationary piece laminations (Figs. 2 and 4).

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is 703-605-4287. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Mon - (every other) Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.



JP
November 18, 2003



Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700